DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)

DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE
August 6, 2002
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements

The Chair of the River and Plateau (RAP) Committee, Pam Brown, welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Vice-chair Susan Leckband to talk about the stewardship program from Department of Energy (DOE) - Headquarters. Since the comment period ends in 30 days, offering comment as a committee is not possible, but she encouraged members to comment on their own by September 6th. Greg deBruler pointed out that the lack of an executive summary would make commenting difficult. Jim Daily, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), referred him to Greg Sullivan, DOE-HQ, but suggested that omission of the executive summary may have been intentional, allowing input on and changes to the draft before writing an executive summary.

Susan Leckband announced that the date for the Hanford Long-Term Stewardship plan workshop has been pushed back; more information will be available at the September Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting. She felt that it was important enough to

warrant a full day discussion. Jim Daily, DOE-RL, said that if all went well, the meeting would be set for Wednesday, November 13th.

Performance Management Plan (PMP) and C3T Overview of Initiatives 1, 3, and 4

Mike Collins, DOE-RL, and Dave Evans, DOE-RL, briefed the committee on Initiatives 1, 3, and 4 of the Performance Management Plan (PMP).

Dave Evans distributed Section 4.1, Strategic Initiatives, from the PMP; this is the only section that has been changed since the committee's last meeting in May. There has been a great deal of work among the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies, especially through the Cleanup Constraints and Challenges Team (C3T). Section 4.1 outlines what DOE-RL hopes to accomplish: continuing work in the 300 Area (with the 324 work as highest priority), proceeding to remove five shipments of spent nuclear fuel by mid-November (currently, the project is at the end of the readiness assessment), and taking down certain buildings, removing facilities in the 100 Area, but leaving the cocooned reactors. The end goal is to remove the river corridor area from the National Priorities List.

Appendix A describes specific commitments to accelerate Hanford Cleanup. The first two milestones will be completed in 2003 – completion of the Interface Control Document and removal and transfer of the five shipments of spent nuclear fuel to the 200 Area. DOE-RL hopes to complete the Complete Interim Safe Storage of six former production reactors (D, F, and H by 2006 and N, KE, and KW by 2012). By 2010, DOE-RL hopes to have complete deactivation and demolition of the 324 and 327 facilities. In 2012, it would like to have complete deactivation and demolition of the 357 remaining 100 and 300 Area excess facilities, as well as complete cleanup of the 100 and 300 Area waste sites and burial grounds.

Given the nature of these technical and unfamiliar situations, there are uncertainties and assumptions, including:

- Waste generated will have an acceptable treatment and disposal pathway.
- The remedial action objectives identified in the Interim Records of Decision (RODs) will be shown to be adequate, resulting in substantive remediation so that final RODs can be issued without further remediation.
- A Long-Term Stewardship (LTS) program will be available to execute necessary LTS requirements.
- The 300 Area facilities will be made available for demolition on schedule.
- Pending update of the Reactor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the Reactor Cocoons will remain in place through 2035.
- The nature and extent of contamination assumed in estimating the extent of remedial actions will not substantially differ from the baseline.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- What is an interface document? *It helps the responsible party where more than one company have work at a common point or location and ensures that tasks are being completed. Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) is doing this now.*

- What is new or different in this document, or is it just faster? *Essentially, this is a demonstration of accelerated work, taking the work goal to a new type of contract so work is done faster and cheaper. This plan is under review.*
- In the Uncertainties/Assumptions section, what does it mean that waste generated will have an acceptable treatment and disposal pathway? Is there a reason not to take the waste out? *We are not exactly sure what is in the burial grounds, so we would not know how to react to the substance until we found out what it contained. We need to continue to reevaluate. It does not mean that we would necessarily leave it in place.*
- What would happen to the contract if you assume that the problem is smaller than it turns out to be? *We would compose a new work scope.*
- This is not objective; you are just trying to justify your decisions regarding the removal of the RODs. *When decisions were made to move contaminants away, we had to follow the rules of the Comprehensive Environmental Response and Compensation Liability Act (CERCLA); the comments were not meant to validate the existing RODs. We assumed that we were accurate. There will always be deviation and we will always react to it.*
- Currently, the springs are failing to meet groundwater standards -- what will DOE-RL do to address that impact? Why are only surface issues being examined? *This initiative does not do much to answer that question. We are hoping that we can remediate source terms, but we are not separating the issues.*
- How can you stay in the scope of the budget when you might find that you have to do other remediation that was not initially considered? *We are going to make certain assumptions, and if those are not adequate to remove the source terms, then we will revise them. In following CERCLA, we have encountered unexpected problems and worked through them.*
- You cannot deal with groundwater independent of the source terms, since the source terms contribute to the groundwater contamination.
- Where does lead go? *Out onto the Central Plateau.*
- Will there be contaminated buildings? *The facilities will be dismantled.*
- What is the timeline for the PMP product? *It was submitted to DOE-Headquarters on July 23rd and they are reviewing it on a case-by-case basis. DOE-RL's plan will most likely be approved, as it met all expectations. This is probably the final product.*
- You cannot release budget numbers, but isn't there a graph in the draft that gives some guidance to out-year budget needs? *Yes.*
- Pam announced that the City of Richland, in line with the comprehensive management plan, would consider changing the land use designation of the 300-Area.

C3T Initiative 3 – Stabilization and De-inventory of Nuclear Materials

Briant Charboneau, DOE-RL, provided an update on Initiative 3, which covers the stabilization and de-inventory of nuclear materials. He reported that the narrative received very few changes since May. DOE-RL now has the option to store plutonium in a new location. To ensure that the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) can be removed, DOE-RL must be sure that the plutonium can be shipped to Savannah River on schedule. The plan is to start removal before the end of next June and be done by the close of fiscal year 2005. However, often there are lawsuits that could slow the shipping process. Since DOE-RL will not know that shipping has been delayed until after it has started removing

the plutonium from its current location, it has considered an alternative site built in the early 1990s that could temporarily hold the material. It is a secure location and would require heavy machinery to access the vault. It would be secure against aircrafts hitting it from the top and would be guarded to ensure no unauthorized access. This would eliminate the threat of the plutonium being loosely contained and is a low-cost option to be used only until DOE-RL receives the go-ahead to ship the waste to its permanent site in Savannah River.

The PFP structures will be removed down to one level of concrete. PFP is not currently contributing to soil contamination and efforts will be taken to ensure that no other contaminants are introduced into the soil. The project finally has funding to begin many of the most substantial tasks. This marks a major transition, moving from the planning phase to actual contaminant and building removal.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- Are there transportation risks in addition to scientific and political risks? *There are several factors that could delay shipment: physical stopping of the trucks, Washington State changing its mind, blockages from the states the materials must be transported through, Savannah River changing its mind (although Savannah River is ready now, as the technical aspects have been approved).*
- Are the temporary vaults built to a rigor to provide safety confidence? *The vaults were made to store high-level waste. They are 3-6 feet thick with an added 2 feet of asphalt on the outside and a leak collection system. The roof structure will be very secure. It was built with nuclear safety analysis. DOE-RL would be borrowing the vault and will restore it to its original condition after moving the materials to Savannah River.*
- When will the plutonium be moved? *June 2003. We will make the decision in March of 2003 whether we will take the material to the vault or to Savannah River.*
- How can we be sure that PFP will keep groundwater safe and free from contamination? What about carbon tetrachloride? *The groundwater people would be more qualified to answer that; it is not part of the PFP package.*
- PFP should be cleaned up, but "slab on grade" should not be the whole answer. The agencies should talk about characterization and exhuming all pipes. What characterization is needed for slab on grade? *Characterization will be done in 2009. This plan does not capture the entire work scope onsite, just items that could save time.*
- Why wait until 2009? Why not design a more aggressive program? *If source terms under the slab, becomes a contamination leak, then we will take care of it at that time. We cannot do anything until we get the buildings taken down.*
- Is there any reason to do an assessment for Savannah River, as well as the location at Hanford? *We are on track to be the next shipment into Savannah River, which is the ultimate target. We need a shipping schedule before we can take the building down.*
- How much room is available in the vault? *The vaults are quite large and we will only be using part of one vault of four.*
- Did you consider the Fuels and Materials Examination Facility (FMEF)? *Yes.*

- Are you going to discuss the spent nuclear fuel in K-basin? *Acceleration in the K-basins is minimal since the project is already going as fast as it can.*

C3T Initiative 4 – Waste Disposal

Rudy Guercia, DOE-RL, updated the committee on the latest developments to Initiative 4 on waste disposal. There were not any major changes to the cesium and strontium plans, since the studies on where those could be disposed are still being planned. The biggest change with the transuranic (TRU) waste initiative was that DOE-RL would receive assistance from Carlsbad, which will provide mobile units to help process TRU waste.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- There is a rumor that the cesium and strontium disposal studies are not going well. *There was no money in the '02 budget to work on the initiative. The studies will begin in October.*
- Does this only address contact-handled TRU waste (CH-TRU)? *There are not many remote handled materials (RH-TRU). The 2015 date is for legacy waste, it does not include 618-10, or -11 RH-TRU. The 2015 date at WIPP is for reducing operations rather than an actual closure date.*
- What is the date cut-off for "legacy volumes"? Any TRU generated after 1970.
- How can we send waste somewhere else when we do not know what we have or how much of it we have? *DOE-RL has been honest with the other DOE sites about informing them that it does not know much about its materials. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) is still an option, since it is not closing.*
- What is the estimated amount of post-1970s TRU? *We have not given any estimates yet.*
- Greg deBruler and Shelly Cimon requested quantity estimates of the pre- and post-1970 TRU, as well as what in the C3T process has been discussed regarding the pre-1970s TRU. *There is nothing moving forward in C3T that is not included in the PMP. The last C3T summary will be circulated to the HAB.*
- Is the general rule of thumb that pre-1970s waste represents about 2/3 of plutonium produced and post-1970s represents approximately 1/3? *For volume, yes. Otherwise it is closer to 50-50.*

Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Record of Decision Amendment

Mike Schlender, DOE-RL, informed the committee that a ROD amendment to the Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would soon be signed. This amendment would only cover two transportation shipments from two small sites that are being cleaned up; one with approximately 150 drums from Battelle-Columbus and another with approximately 50 drums from ETAC. Any future shipments would have to come from separate amendments. The shipments are of waste that will be processed at Hanford before being shipped to WIPP, once WIPP has determined that it can receive the waste. Carlsbad would bear the cost rather than Hanford.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- Does DOE-RL have any assurance that a certification will be granted? *We are at least a year from getting any kind of certification.*
- How many other sites could ship TRU waste to Hanford? *There could be an eastern and western hub. There are approximately six western sites.*

Regulator Perspective

- Laura Cusak, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said that Ecology is optimistic and would like to capitalize on the opportunities presented by the initiatives. Ecology is proceeding with caution, since several things may not come to fruition, and would like a plan B to fall back on. Ecology is not interested in moving ahead with the intention that the quality of the cleanup would decrease. Regarding TRU shipments, Ecology's level of anxiety with TRU shipments hinges on how DOE wants to handle the mixed waste. Laura Cusak did not know the status on the Attorney General's request for a Governor's Agreement.
- Dave Einan, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), echoed Ecology's comments that EPA does not want to decrease the quality of cleanup. Achieving cleanup faster is ideal, but the level of quality must remain the same. A baseline is needed. It is not possible to predict everything that could come up in the project and there must be a way to handle the assumptions either way. Regarding the "slab on grade," it will happen, whether or not it happens on time, because the scope exists.

Performance Management Plan and C3T Overview of Initiatives 5 and 6

Dick Wilde, Fluor, said that under Initiative 6, groundwater protection would be moved from Phase 1 (studies) to Phase 2 (getting on with cleanup). Initiative 5 would include the uranium plume around U-plant. There are five canyons, covered in the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI). A regional approach to cleanup is needed and would involve making a boundary around the U-plant canyon. DOE-RL plans to deal with the U-plant canyon by cleaning all the ancillary buildings, decommissioned wells, leaking water lines and the waste sites themselves (the source of the uranium plume) by 2011. Then, based on how well that schedule is maintained, DOE-RL would clean the other areas as distinct regions. Although called a test, it would really be an actual cleanup. The first step is going through the RODs for 2003 and 2004, and then addressing the water lines, wells and waste sites by September of 2006 since those are still leaking uranium. The remaining time until 2011 could be spent on the facilities and the canyon.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- If the water lines are clean, why not cap them? *It would be purely a precautionary measure.*
- Is there anything that was talked about regarding remediation? *We talked about how many water lines to remove and how many to cap. That is due in 2004, but we make assumptions for budget purposes.*
- What about using the canyon itself as a dumpsite by taking the walls down? *Using the canyon as a disposal site for other wastes was an option, but Initiative 5 proposes not to do that. This plan would take only the waste from the U-Plant region about 10-*

15 feet above the grade and then install a cap. For the next canyon, we could discuss the option of using it for other waste disposal.

Strategic Initiative #6 - Groundwater

John Morse, DOE-RL, discussed the areas of focus in Initiative 6. The five main elements are: 1) high risk source control; 2) recharge conditions; 3) shrink the contaminated footprint of the Central Plateau; 4) resolve current pump and treat issues and 5) integrate site monitoring actions.

The C3T groundwater group is developing a groundwater strategy for Hanford. This initiative is aligned with that strategy.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- Where does technology fit in with this plan and how much has been done? *Very little. There are too many high-level risk areas to finish all characterization by September 2008; then actual cleanup would not happen by 2025. The regular CERCLA processes will be followed, but now we will go directly into cleanup instead of waiting afterward to get the authorization.*
- Will you follow the processes for high-level risk? *The formal CERCLA process takes up a great deal of time to get from the initial stages to the actual cleanup. There are two approaches we could use: the CERCLA approach and the observational approach. CERCLA is the basic, conventional approach whereas the observational approach is used for smaller sites that will undergo excavation and disposition. The observation approach is quicker and cheaper for lower risk sites, but it is only cheaper when it is small enough so that approximate excavation volumes are known.*
- How much characterization is planned in the particular waste sites? *In BC, the cribs and the tank farms have already been characterized.*
- In the BC crib, how much characterization money will be spent? Will capping be included? *We do not have any idea on funding levels, but we will go through the entire process to get the money. Regarding capping, we are looking at the easiest approach.*
- Why decontaminate and decommission wells? *Doing so creates a solid band around a well, preventing migration of groundwater contaminants.*
- Did Ecology request that 26 wells be installed? *Jane Hedges, Ecology, said that about half of the wells are in place; there is a need to produce a list that determines wells needed. Twenty-six was an estimate.*
- When will the Groundwater Strategy be ready? *Hopefully in October.*
- In the overview of plans of the Hanford site, all wells are marked. Does this include the 26 planned by Ecology? *It only shows the wells that are in the ground.*

Regulator Perspective

- Jane Hedges, Ecology, commented that Ecology had advised moving ahead on this and to put money behind it. Overall, it is a very positive step to take large chunks off of the big picture. High-risk, important items could move up the priority list, speeding the process.

Carbon Tetrachloride Update

Virginia Rohay, CH2M-Hill Hanford Group (CHG), and Bruce Ford, Fluor, updated the committee on the search for potential sources of carbon tetrachloride outside of known carbon tetrachloride disposal areas. It has been a multi-step investigation along pipelines and other possible routes into groundwater. The first step was looking into burial grounds and going from there to progressively deeper soils. They know of some cribs that do contain carbon tetrachloride and they are looking at waste sites that do not have a documented carbon tetrachloride disposal, but are examining sites above high-level plumes. The next step is to look at the upper part of the vadose zone and continue searching deeper in the soils. This step is in the early stages and has already been broken into two steps: 1) a sweep for obvious carbon tetrachloride deposits, especially in vent risers, and 2) how carbon tetrachloride is affecting the groundwater.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- Does this information indicate how effective pump and treat is? *It shows where all the sources are and whether a bigger pumping system is needed. Two years of investigation will provide a narrower idea of the sites.*
- What is a major source of carbon tetrachloride? *Places where it was poured down drains. However, it has been a while since the carbon tetrachloride was dumped, so the investigation includes examination of a 3-dimentional area where the carbon tetrachloride could have moved through the groundwater to other locations.*
- Gerry Pollet voiced several concerns regarding the carbon tetrachloride issues. He was concerned that only three trenches had been sampled, that high levels of carbon tetrachloride were found in Riser 4, and that chloroform was vented in excess of the legal limits close to trench 1, where employees are working without supplied air. He felt that Ecology should stop use of trench 1, that there should be a full-scale investigation of all burial grounds and that steps should be taken to protect worker health. Organic wastes are being disposed of in all trenches in waste management unit 4, which is not being dealt with, as only carbon tetrachloride and chloroform are being tested for. *John Price, Ecology, said that additional sampling is being done. Jane Hedges, Ecology, said that 12 new vadose zone wells are surrounding trench 4 and the EPA is looking into it. Susan Leckband advised moving this subject to the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee, or under the River and Plateau Committee's work plan under solid waste.*
- Todd expressed interest in knowing what information is or is not being gathered, and what should be gathered.

Regulator Perspective

- Dave Einan, EPA, did not wish to speak for the EPA without Dennis Faulk's comments. Pam Brown asked Dennis Faulk to send comments to Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, when he is prepared.

- Jane Hedges, Ecology, said that Ecology is very interested in the results and that the key is to get an ongoing study. In terms of low-level groundwater, there is a strong

link that should be tied together. It is important to plan wells, since they could provide information for everyone.

Response to HAB Advice #125, 100-30 Area Change Package

Issue Managers Gordon Rogers and Greg deBruler discussed the July HAB meeting and the advice that was returned for comment. Gordon expressed satisfaction with the format and the content of the response (which was available in hard copy format at the committee meeting). Greg felt the response was deficient in certain areas, such as tribal issues.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- Todd Martin, HAB Chair, liked the approach of picking out comments and responding, though the comment on the 300 Area and waste sites was not clearly responded to. Is there further clarification? *Mike Goldstein, EPA, said that future milestones had been set to discuss the comments and to clarify commitments on cleanup. Beth Bilson, DOE-RL, would like that to happen in the next year.*
- What happens to a building once it is transferred from Nuclear Energy to Environmental Management? *DOE could not say which buildings would be transferred because that part of the planning had not been conducted yet.*
- Will there be interim milestones*? Yes, we are still working towards the 2012 deadlines, but there are still assumptions and it is difficult to make firm commitments. The buildings south of Cyprus would be left standing.*
- The river corridor was supposed to be unrestricted except for industrial use. That is beneficial because it is good for the Tri-Cities area, but there is also a need to protect human and environmental health. Since a major concern is groundwater, how can DOE claim to protect human and environmental health when ignoring groundwater? *Clearly, there is a problem with groundwater, but there are no sufficient techniques yet to address it. We certainly want to meet groundwater standards, but have not been able to meet them yet. It is dependent on "assuming institutional structures are maintained." Even after the source terms have been eliminated, there will still be residual effects.*
- The HAB advice said DOE should show what is being done to protect groundwater. Beth Bilson said that the DOE-RL response basically states that it was a useful question that DOE-RL will address. Mike Goldstein, EPA, added that the analysis does not answer all questions raised, but the agencies will share ideas once thoughts are more solid. He emphasized that this change package was not about whether the land would be industrial or unrestricted; it was about timing.
- The committee decided to revisit Advice #128 and #130 at its next meeting, and revisit the response to Advice #125 once the results of two relevant reports are available to review.

HAB Priority Focus: Acceleration

Todd Martin, HAB Chair, distributed a memo summarizing what participants in the HAB leadership retreat had decided ought to be the focus of the HAB. At the end of the year, the goal is to be able to cross items off of the list and have a quantifiable way to know what the HAB has done. The dates listed as schedule goals to have addressed each item

are not set in stone and rely on the agencies' timelines. Each committee must decide how it will participate, i.e., through joint committee meetings, lone committee meetings, conference calls, etc.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- Is there agreement that the 2012 deadline will be met, even with changing the land use strategies? We have provided advice on the 2012 deadline. If we all agree on acceleration, we would need to alter our plans.
- Todd Martin recognized that the PMP represents the first time an agency has acknowledged a connection between tank farms and the Central Plateau. But, he conceded, planning on completing the task in a year will be difficult.
- End states should be added to this list, since the HAB has been talking about it for some time and it has yet to be addressed.
- There should be a clear distinction between unrestricted cleanup and unrestricted use. The definitions are based on rural and residential use when there are other scenarios. *The standards for both unrestricted and industrial are different; we do not need new definitions.*
- Pam Brown observed that that by the time the committee starts on the issues, the agencies will have produced a work plan. She commented that the HAB leadership group reached consensus about getting a better understanding on groundwater issues and characterization perspectives. The committee should start with that in the October/November committee meeting timeframe.

Regulator Perspective

- Nick Seto, EPA, said that EPA is trying to get cleanup moved forward, but refuses to compromise. He assured the committee that EPA would not neglect cleanup quality in favor of acceleration.
- Max Power, Ecology, commented that the agencies are going to have to deal with some of these issues sooner than outlined in the memo. Ecology has changed milestones and dates to get this done and should continue with that strategy.
- John Price, Ecology, said that Ecology needs a final ROD, which is underway and should be coming to a close in 2005, though that may not necessarily be the final ROD. There should be a complete soil cleanup for BC by 2005. Ecology does not have a work plan specifically, but is planning a strategy to get that started.
- Nick Seto, EPA, asked what unrestricted land use meant to the HAB. There should be a briefing in the next couple of months to gain input from everyone. It is crucial to define the problems so people know what the costs are. There is a staff meeting planned in August to talk about the work plan strategy with regard to acceleration cleanup.

<u>Exposure Scenario Task Force Draft Advice</u>

Gariann Gelston briefed the committee on the Exposure Scenario Task Force draft advice. Feedback should be directed to Doug Huston (carbon copy to Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues). Regarding the timeline, everyone can say directly when things should happen and which they could individually participate in. The discussion centered on the area outside the fenceline in the 300 Area.

Committee Discussion/Questions

- Does the Hanford National Monument protect the entire Hanford site? *The National Monument stops before the 300 Area so there are areas that are not covered under the National Monument laws.*

Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW-EIS)

Mike Collins, DOE-RL, described the recent open houses on the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW-EIS).

Committee Discussion/Questions

- Gerry Pollet asked about the 30-day advance notice for public meetings, since a meeting was scheduled to take place two weeks after the previous meeting. Mike Collins explained that it was a follow-up meeting designed specifically for those at the first meeting who did not have a chance to voice their opinions.
- Gerry Pollet and Harold Heacock felt that DOE-RL did not adequately notify the public about the open houses. Susan Leckband suggested giving the matter to the Public Involvement Committee.

Regulator Perspective

- Max Power, Ecology, said that Ecology had been reviewing the EIS and was disappointed that it did not help anyone understand the harm or benefit of importing waste. The EIS was deficient in several other areas where issues were omitted. Ecology will have comments for the hearings and will share the comments with the committee via email for the September meeting.

Committee Business

- The committee adopted the May meeting summary. Mike Collins, DOE-RL, was the only one to provide comment.
- Groundwater issue managers will meet in September to plan future work; there will be no full committee meeting.
- There committee check-in call scheduled for August 13 was deemed unnecessary and was cancelled.
- The committee redesigned its work plan, labeling each active task with a priority level and describing others as "watch" items. The revised plan will be distributed with the August meeting summary.

Handouts

- River and Plateau Committee Agenda; August 6, 2002.
- Strategic Initiatives, 4.1 and Appendix A, taken from the Hanford Performance Management Plan, August 2002.
- Carbon Tetrachloride Concentrations in Pump-and-Treat Remediation Area, June 1996 and August 2001.
- The Hanford Advisory Board's Priority Focus: Acceleration (drafted by Todd Martin).

- Hanford Advisory Board Exposure Scenario Task Force Draft Advice on the River Corridor (drafted by Doug Huston), August 5, 2002.
- Comments on the Draft Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement (drafted by Max Power), August 6, 2002.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Pam Brown	Shelly Cimon	Jim Curdy (phone)
Greg deBruler	Geriann Gelston	Harold Heacock
Dave Johnson	Susan Leckband	Todd Martin
Debra McBaugh	Gerry Pollet	Gordon Rogers
Dan Simpson	John Stanfill	Dave Watrous

Others

Kevin Bazzel, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Nancy Meyers, BHI
Beth Bilson, DOE-RL	Laura Cusak, Ecology	Virginia Rohay, CHG
Briant Charboneau, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique
Mike Collins, DOE-RL	Max Power, Ecology	Courtney Harris, EnviroIssues
Jim Daily, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Dave Evans, DOE-RL	Dave Einan, EPA	Bruce Ford, Fluor Hanford
Rudy Guercia, DOE-RL	Mike Goldstein, EPA	Mark Gibson, Fluor Hanford
John Morse, DOE-RL	Nick Ceto, EPA	Ken Hladek, Fluor Hanford
George Sanders, DOE-RL		George Jackson, Fluor Hanford - PFP
Mike Schlender, DOE-RL		Dick Wilde, Fluor Hanford
Todd Shrader, DOE-RL		Barbara Wise, Fluor Hanford
Yvonne Sherman, DOE-RL		Peter Bengtson, PNNL
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL		John Stang, Tri-City Herald